All the technologies as well as other ideas I, Treon Verdery, think of are public domain.

Longevity technology: Hordenine is a MAO-B inhibitor, thus possibly it has longevity effects like deprenyl. One thing online says, “[at hordenine] dimethylated version of Tyramine (the amino acid). Commonly found in herbal supplements, it is used as an effective MAO-B inhibitor’ **Some organisms naturaylly produce hordenine, “has also been detected in some algae and fungi” Copying the hordenine producing gene or heightening the activity of a methylating enzyme on tyramine seems likely to less difficult/easier than producing an entire deprenyl**

small molecule. So screening hordenine and molecular variants as a longevity drug makes sense.

Hordenine effects "taar" like phenylethylamine (PEA) so might block/amplify PEA effects. "In a study of the effects of a large number of compounds on a rat trace amine receptor (rTAR1) expressed in HEK 293 cells, hordenine, at a concentration of 1 μM, had almost identical potency to that of the same concentration of β-phenethylamine in stimulating cAMP production through the rTAR1. The potency of tyramine in this receptor preparation was slightly higher than that of hordenine."

Hordenine could reduce harm to plants or crops from insects,

"Hordenine has been found to act as a feeding deterrent to grasshoppers (*Melanoplus bivittatus*),[38] and to caterpillars of *Heliothis virescens* and *Heliothis subflexa*; the estimated concentration of hordenine that reduced

feeding duration to 50% of control was 0.4M for *H. virescens* and 0.08M for *H. subflexa*.[39]" **suggesting possible value to genetically engineering it into leaves and awns.**

math entertainment "in essence, differentiable learning involves a single, enormous mathematical function--a much more sophisticated version of a high school calculus equation--arranged as a neural network, with each component of the network feeding information forward and backward" https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2019-04/hms-fr041619.php makes me think of a math function with simultaneous action, and the "feeding information forward and backward" part being like, or suggesting that: also: just as

some equations might use a minimal definition of time, there could be different minimal definitions of time, and some of these versions of time could have different effects and intrinsic forms; so like a matrix that updates from

the edge toward the center might have different step number than a linear raster scan; and some topologies of time style are non-reducible to (arrangements of linear rays). Then there is my perception of how some equations have instantaneous solutions, while others have iterable solutions; iterations, and iteration style reminds me of different styles of time; At different nonreducible styles of time some math things could be described, or perhaps solved, with just one, just two, or several, iterations that use a different style of time. Like x=y^3 is instantly solved as a graph, or can be iterated to find values as a plug-in function; So at a different shape or style of time x=y^3 could be iterated using the novel

time form/style twice or 7 times to produce a solved system, like my perception of that equation being fully present/solved as just a visual graph.

It is possible to see how different styles of time, iterate at a different quantity of events to produce a math value. Reminds me of a wavelet being a wave representation/solving a wave in less chunks than a fourier transform. So there could be some new computer science in the realm of new styles of time that iterate equations and programs differently. Also, they could look to physics to find naturally occuring time styles that are novel or new to computer science and math.

Perhaps parsimonious descriptions of these different styles of time could be made, and then physics looked at to see if some things like photons or particles have different parsimoniously stated ideas or styles of time. **Then there could be math-thought and actual equations about what it means when two kinds or styles of time overlap, or meet each other.**

Sort of like two fourier waves can meet each other, or a fourier can meet a wavelet, or a fourier can meet a square wave: parsimoniously stated and

different time styles could meet each other, like the very predictable, linear meets parallel update of a grid or matrix like #, or better, as part of time style have the plural object or variable system expand from center, or concentrically narrow from perimeter; There are many possible different parsimonious time styles that could have mathematical development as well as be searched for at actual physics: also the minimum iteration topology/shape definition that causes a turing tape machine or a 1,1,0 automata sequence to advance and “do” could be another style of time. A new time more-than-sequence/geometry style one-fold topology like a mobius strip could contain a novel

time style, much less complex than a time style-topology as well as topological space of a turing machine. SO there could be all these math-like definitions of topologies of time that are non-reducible to each other, that is they are fundamental components, and then they could study what happens when these styles of time meet each other; They would also look at observed physics to see if any actual things have mutually observed and potentially also mathematically exclusive time styles.

Things with mutually exclusive time styles might be definitionally unable to interact, reminds me of a new technological thing like the light cone yet possibly baseable in a much wider range of actual

physics materials. Thermal or electrical, integrated circuit at computer, insulators. You could make something that was noneraseable even with linear ray vector time, which the 20th century AD seemed to think was usual. a novel kind of permanance. Handy at nanotechnology for longevity/system maintenance to identicality.
Likewise you could make something that was more erasable at a wider number of parsimoniously different time styles. That could have novel entropy effects, and just being a bit literal, could possibly cause higher energy density at chemical systems with multi time-style easy erasability.

What is the effect of new styles of time at Claude Shannon’s things like highest effective error codes/error reduction codes when a parsimoniously defined time style goes beyond the interator or vector ray version (just one of a plurality of possible time styles) that people used to think about chronoprogression and or/compuiteration and/or instantaneous solution of a function, when though about with Shannon’s intellectual content.

Thinking Shannon, new math based on time styles could be possible that effects computers and the structure of knowledge like probability. Updating probability could improve scientific research and engineering.

Different parsimonious time styles could possibly effect relativity, making groovy new technological relativity shapes, as relativity equations might work differently on time styles comparing linear ray, than on a concentric modification matrix (possibly the time form of passing a sphere through a sheet), or a minimal time motioning topology of a 1,1,0 automata, and the nifty idea applying relativity to the time styles of waving back and forth, tide-like that is a parsimonious time style (and might be physically at the delayed quantum choice eraser)

Basically a version or time style (possibly mathematically bigger definition, perhaps a little like the

thing/hole pair of phonon math which has back and forth described in one equation) sequence, like two parallel track bidirectional sequence, or one track that can go back and forth) (phonon math version) **where back and forth (slish slosh) is a normal, equation-described part of that time object definition.** Just as an aside, time reversability at things like delayed quantum choice eraser, could be described mathematically with equations to make slish-slosh time object description (found in physics/nature), as a technological application then

that slish-slosh math object could be applied to neural network node topologies to deposit/accumulate/form/create object-value at their node composition.

I have no idea what a slish-slosh parsimonious time style or other parsimonius new time styles would mean to relativity, or the technology chapes that can be made with relativity, (among them observer-frame simulaneity and non-simultaneity coexisting)

Slish-slosh time style makes me think of neural network nodes being updated, as a particular object form at a time style, “arranged as a neural network, with each component of the

network feeding information forward and backward” Basically a version of time or sequence where back and forth (slish slosh) is a normal, equation-described part of that time style object definition. Could a slish-slosh time style math improve the math and function of neural networks? Being extreme, could actual different observed physics of different time-styles, note and create value at, natural slish-slosh systems being used at new technology of neural network computers, and possibly integrated circuit matter compositions; during 2019 AD, at photonics the delayed quantum choice eraser could easily be modified to be an oscillating precausal system that slish sloshes data at a neural network

node geometry/computer program.

Just as an aside, time reversability at things like delayed quantum choice eraser, could be described mathematically with equations to make slish-slosh time style object description (found in physics/nature), this could heighten efficiency of computer software as well as the computer-actually-made-of matter, that slish-slosh math style object could be applied to neural network node topologies to deposit/accumulate/form/create node-object-value at their node composition. Basically it could make nerual networks, better, faster, more descriptive of the task, as well as more

mathematically and topologically diverse in a way that supports applications, notably as a technology as well as a nifty math thing.

What if it was possible to develop a better, more-changing-at-each-“limned function”-occurence-of-activity, form of time style from the existing math of slish-slosh? Something better than the first, initially figured out, and equationally described, slish-slosh?

Along with the awesome math, Slish-slosh2 could be a new kind of computer clock (perhaps replace the word “clock” there with “active chronotopology”) Also, a new way to address the actual physical things on

integrated circuits that would produce more time goodiness out of the possibly measurable energy input that becomes/instantiates the new form of time style used to chronotopology-drive (formerly “clock”) the knowledge modifying and generating technology, MGT (previous word for MGTis kind of: computer, but”computer” might be a word that previously impliedmath forms with ray-like time style sequence of solving.) or put the previous way: The new time styles produce technologizable actual things that replace computer clocks and architecture; these actual things make the computers do the equivalent of solving the previously unsolvable, going faster, or being more reliable

(Shannon), loading up neural network nodes with cheap identity production/reweighting. among various possible improvements)

Incidentally, looking at probability, as a entertainment phenomenon along with the usual emphasis on prediction: What does it mean if a function perfectly describes a data set? One version or view is that that a raster-like bounded data image, perfectly stated as a function (there's that function I saw on youtube that draws any raster image) could have predictive irrelevance, unless there was a "position" or "environment" operator that showed which way the data would drift if some equation were applied to it, as an

instant function, or time applied tothe drift, or a new time-styleform applied to the fully-predictive equation (like the raster one).

So just thinking about it, “What does it mean if a function perfectly describes a data set?”, if, big if, the data set is based on observed things like science, It could mean that the function has some non-zero probability of having “leading information” as to what actual thing the dataset is!

You might be able to have probability above chance ((at a finite, or with sufficient math, perhaps nonfinite) at a list of possible things something could be) like something is more likely

to be physically sourced in time series data if it had a poisson distribution, or it might be able to speculate that something with a normal distribution was made up of many samples of something that could be multiply recombined.
So, a function that defines a dataset in its entireity, at least with numbers derived from measurement, might contain clues as to what the dataset is.
Now I perceive there are an arbitrary nonfinite number of equations that will describe any finite dataset, so the idea of winnowing out “what it might actually be” from chance seems peculiar, but if you make a big list of every equation that has previously been used to predict something at the scientific

literature, and then you use that short list of 1 million (or more) equations to see if any of them are partially, or quantifiably partiually expressed, like among the million stats models to screen the data-containing function for, a poisson distribution might be found ob being “leading information” of the function that precisely produces all the actual data.

Then you could do an experiment, getting more data (than that described at the all-data-descriptive function), to verify or refute that the poisson distribution was actually a valid statistical shape, or possible methodology, at the one-function data. Poisson treats things that change over chronointerval. So

you could do something non-time dependent, that does not change chronointerval, and still see if it changed the data in a way that reinforced or supported, or even refuted the previous “fit” of thinking the data was a poisson distribution.

So this idea that you might be able to find, or dredge up, something (like a numeric relation, possibly a statistics model), that at a previous million scientific publications, had predictive value somewhere sometime, and systematically find it in an equation or function that precisely, even like raster-equation, produces all the fixed and actual (measured) data could be possible.

This compare it to the big set of all previous valid models, ever, thing: Brings up the idea of something new to me, which is that there are big human knowledge sets you can compare everything to, then do instantaneous math to solve. The possible efficiency or new math of value here is that when you solve for two equations (Function one: function might raster-scan fully describing all data. Function two: a big pile of math instantaneously represents all previously useful statistical math, like T value equation, Z value equation, poisson distribution; a million others) This overlaying (solving) of the two functions can be instantaneous, where dolving the two instantaneous equations is

morer rapid than something that iterates; that makes it more rapidly solvable with computers. Also, the generation of fresh equations comparing the stats/numeric methods “periodic table like thing”could have optimizable completely new equations that describe things, or computer algorithms if the mathematician or programmer felt like doing the new knowledge generation; (those new equations improves velocity of computation and likely extends capability as well)

The benefit here is that a person has some data, then on screening the 1 million stats/numeric methods “periodic table” this program tells them what its about: like, “periodically repeated

poisson and log distribution found” often describes repeated cycles of (perhaps seasonal or daily growth). Perhaps an improved piece of software suggests that the data, on periodic-table-style screening could suggest to the human that the driver and source of the data might be a time of day at a sytem with moving components.

Unbeknownst to the software or the human, the software might have been looking at trolley ridership. The program found drivers and numeric methods sources without referring to the actual matter or energy composition of the thing being analyzed.

If any of the actual existing

matter-based structure is available to the human, then of course the human can look at that, devise an experiment, and indeed change the trolley fare on time of day, to see if it affects ridership. The thing is that using a million previously predictive equation set (periodic table function comparison system), these kinds of things like suggesting trolley passes, or rather adjustments to the equation with a predicted mechanism that is equivalent to introducing a trolley pass, can be done and tested without a human-generated hypothesis.

The software could find and describe areas of the overlapping (function 1 function 2) equations, where slight changes are most

likely to have large measurable effects. The software could suggest: “find an item which can be rescheduled, if it changes the poisson-distribution-like-character of the fully-describing raster function then the poisson description is more likely to be an actual driver.”

Really impressive software could come up with winnowing the ease of experiment, that is suggesting the easist possible change that validates or refutes a periodic-table-of-one-million-numeric-methods numerically autogenerated or the fresh human (or various AI) generated hypothesis.

Better software could winnow tests of these hypothesis with

suggesting experiments that are the equivalent to giving out complimentary bus passes and finding out how the new data changes, as compared with the more effortful rescheduling of trolleys, or the effortful moving of entire trolley stations; any of these experiments would modify what appeared to the software to be a poisson distribution, so with that modification the idea that a poisson distribution is a descriptor/driver of the phenomenon issupported.

The software has suggested things used to verify the poisson (chronological interval sequenced) distribution being an authentic attribute of the system. So the result of the winnowing and experiment would be a new

system predictive equation, that has generated its own deductive "looks like an actual thing" component, by finding a plausible and successfully tested deductive-able from the periodic-table of numeric methods list that got simultaneous-function solved. Note humans and AI can of course think of complely new things outside and/or possibly addable to the numeric methods periodic table. It is just that this is software that finds both standout bases for deduction as well as generates more accurately predictive equations.

(more notes that came before some of the previous writing)

(about the library of a million or more previously published

numeric relationships) It is primitive thinking on my part, but it reminds me of the periodic table. You can scan any physical object against it and get a match, and that match (elemental composition) then predicts what the thing might do, and what it can be turned into. So layering an equation, possibly a function, that happens to produce a poisson distribution onto a periodic table of 1 million statistics models) makes it say, since it is an observation of an actual thing it might be: "poisson distribution". Then like an element on the periodic table, "poisson distribution" means, that, besides testing new hypothesis and/or validating a model's equations:

You can do things to it to get predictable, possibly technologizable effects or experimentally predictable effects just like you could with an element: like halve sampling rate yet still have numeric adequacy to make p<.01 predictions; or, on finding that a normal distribution was present, that you could double sampling rate to measure a new value farther out along a standard deviation value, like a really high number or a really high spectral emissions band event. So a variation on the million numeric method thing that finds sources and drivers of actual data, including new synthetic deduced thingables, could be used to suggest different measurements that that improve phenomena investigation,

basically kind of like this suggests better optics: see rarer events, see bigger or smaller events, possibly even trace event contingencies with an experiment/new measurement on the system. That has technological applications as well, It is kind of obvious to a person, but if you say, “measure twice as many leaves, you are likely to find a new biggest one” and you want to find a plant with big leaves so you can breed it to be a better agricultural crop, then the software suggesting doubled frequency of observation has a cognitively comprehensible technology benefit.

Also the math of a static function descriptor of the data (there are much better ones than the raster

equation as a function that can describe an entire data set, but it was mentioned); when overlain, or instantly-function computed aka equation solved at a million element instantly solveable, definitional eqaution, (is it possible to make a really big equation that simultaneously contains many numeric method equations in it?) is possibly much faster than some other methods.

That high instant solvability version of the equations, among them the one that generates all the actual data, could make it so some questions about the data, and/or the source/structure/drivers of the data are computable as an effect of the overlaying or simultaneous solution of two equations; that is

it theoretically instant, as compared with the duration of iteration at a computer-software derived solution.

I read that a deep learning AI can do protein folding calculations a million times faster than some previous numeric method. https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2019-04/hms-fr041619.php

It is possible a different version of the “million published numeric methods” periodic table-like function could actually be an AI, neural network, or deep learning object created thing. I perceive there is research into instant-identity solvable equations (possibly differential equations) that represent, possibly deep

learning (to name one approach), math function an AI has trained into being at a neural network. So, perhaps the incremental chronological-moment utilizing, (similar to: amount of time at a linear geometry; other geometries would have different time-styles) effect of using a computer on data, where an AI studies the data, could be gotten around or speeded up with the math function workalike of the AI's neural network.

So, basically there's this thing, where if you have a million numeric-method thing that is like a periodic table, and you find matches on it, and then the software suggests an experiment to verify that the numeric method is predictive/meaningfully

descriptive, and furthermore the numeric method might be correlated, linked, or perhaps 1:1 linked, that is directive, of a physics/chemistry/biology sourcing form. So how can this be used? As described at a Quora answer I wrote responding to something like "if correlation does not imply causation, what does it imply?" I found applications from finding steering constellations, called marionettes, among them possibly completely new marionettes. One marionette might be social wealth being upstream of child raising style and government spending, which is actually one mathematically findable big part (one arm of the marionette [+]) that finds a basis

for the “implausible absent further upstream hypothesis” correlation of hanging with building space stations.

Uses: so finding new arms of new marionettes creates new areas of chemistry, biology, genetics, social media, communications, quantitative psychology, and even sociology that can be used to describe, and make testable experiments on, things that effect human existence and well being.

During 2019 AD a human mind mind think,”does air pollution have an epigenetic effect?” then devises an experiment.

This numeric method matching software traces a plurality of effects at the big instant equation

of everything that's been published, then at least some of these, perhaps 1 per thousand (period-table like objects) could be testable as to whether they had epigenetic components, that are upstream from the previously described math thing that is where you find an upstream source (marionette, marionette arm) to generate a hypothesis testable relationship from examining a bunch of correlations, notably some which to a human would seem imlausible. restated: the software finds correlations that may then be hypothesis tested as to whether they have an epigeneitic component.

The software then produces a list of 1000 or more new human-

unconsidered subjects that have pre-experiment math support for being epigenetically controlled (the math at the published papers looks a lot like the math that crops up at epigenetic systems).

Then if the software is really effective, it finds those (testable for epigenetics math and topic objects) where the output of the equations has the highest generated change with the smallest variable change. This finding of sensitive spots, at a vast number of different objects, facilitates easy robust experimental measurements; that then creates a littler list of possibly epigeneticslly driven things amenable to really easy, possibly fast, or few-sample experiments that the software

numerically thinks will provide large magnitudes of difference at their measured results.

So, instead of one human, grabbing one idea out of their mind, and testing it, the software comes up with a (repeatedly concentrated) list of say 100 things likely to have epigenetic-contributions, or even effect-directing contributions, and then lists these epigenetic testable hypothesis out: Then a human looks through them to find ones of interest to humans, like chocolate milk has epigenetic effects on the, 2019 majority, of elementary school students that drink it. (the software figured

out school lunches were easy to test/modify, and might have figured out it is easy to change them if that change is beneficial)

Another epigenetic thing the softwaremight list as being the kind of thing that could be experimented on to produce knowledge with high numeric validity support is: “working two part time jobs has measurable epigenetic difference from one full time job, both have the same epigenetic change direction that is away from the epigenetic effects of unemployment”, Then of course the software could find things that cause the same epigenetic effect (actual like proteome and other -ome effects) as that form of renumerated labor that has the highest participant

satisfaction.

That new non-work epigenetic functionalike might then be tested, (near here the humans, informed by the software, are directing the experiment generation) to generate a health, cheerfulness, optimism, wellness, measures of romantic-partner-things-going-well that is epigenetically functional at unemployed persons, retirees, and might possibly be “double dosable” at the already employed to confer even greater epigenetic benefits.

Again, the thing is, the software generates very large numbers of screened for human value, and ease of (and high validity of) experiment hypotheses. That

goes well with new science discoveries and devleopable technologies that benefit human beings, that is people.

Along with humans reading the lists of easy potentially awesome experiments it is possible software could seek value for humans. The software could winnow the list based on any previously published connection to the 1000 or 10,000 most salient, popular, physically relevant, or beneficially entertaining topics.

There is an actual, if perhaps unimportant risk of looking for things that have already been thought of. If the software goes looking for things that people currently consider beneficial, then

humans-in-general might get less mind-share about new things that they would later value but do not, yet, have a preference at numeric methods table based software discovery.

Personal computers during the 20th century AD were new, and contribute much to human well being. But if a 1968 hypothesis ranking/easy test software were active it might promote research into new greetings and new kinds of small talk that were projected to raise interpersonal satisfaction, and quantitatively measured willingness to assist 50%. These are valuable new word forms of conversation if they exist, yet it also would be nice if the software could think of personal computers.

(as an aside, these 50% upgrades on pleasant conversation and willingness to assist already exist; garments and social manners, notably varied at the population, can already do this. I might have read that hitchhikers get picked up several times faster in a suit!, so that is a few hundred percent.)

Also, there is of course a difference between what the upstream from correlation/numeric methods matching/ easy-test hypothesis generating software suggests that people research, create, make and do and the actual amount and content of what they do. There is a lot of variation, and although correlation software may find several things with more

marionette-arm activity, that is testable, adjustable directive causation, than money, it is possible that people would only economically participate at things that are both actively beneficial as well as possible to value, and or be enjoyed.

Adjustable things that have an effect; I use the word "marionette" or "marionette arm" to say a thing that has causal, notably mathematically modelable, likely predictable, and experimentally testable structure or object that drives an effect.

Some marionette arms are known, discussed, and frequently people suggest improvements at the known ones. (basically a marionette or marionette arm is

like a constellation of contributing effect-drivers, notably derived from looking upstream from correlations at actual published things; also the use of a somewhat periodic-table like list of numeric relations used to find what math apparently describes/drives a then testable thing). Some things that might be marionettes that previously have a mixed reputation, could be improved when people figure out more about them. Things that are described as having "externalities" Free trolley fare causes more employment opportunity but has the externality of reducing people having private vehicles which then reduces recreational activity and scope somewhat.

Money could be measured as having a particular magnitude of effect, and then the software could be directed to describe testable numerically-found things that have a bigger effect. It is possible some of those bigger than money things would be completely new to human beings, thus early technologies might make big improvoments as the 80/20 rule (20% of the effort produces 80% of the results) might be going on, at least as compared with the continuing minute adjustments to money like debit cards. Romance could have higher upstream causative effect at various measurables than money. Not only does being partnered often cause children, and human physiological children are awesome and wonderful, and

I think there should be more human physiological children, children possibly adjust fiscal capability more than something like the greater job mobility and earnings increase from a college degree; dissolving a romantic partnership can strongly change expense ratios, perhaps even more than almost any thrifty <->luxiourious city locationing of the person. The software might show romance is a stronger marionette cause than money, and the software could suggest a software-generated list of testable hypothesis with predicted high responsiveness. Giving single people memberships at online personals sites, with a hypothesis that this will produce greater happiness and earnings might be the kind of easy

experiment the software generates. Humans would of course, at least sometimes, review and improve the suggested hypotheses and experiments. So a human might modifty the experiment to be: Give single people memberships at online personals sites on their birthday.

There is also value to having the software that matches published data and numeric methods at a kind of periodic table to generate experiments that then support/verify the driving/causal effect of particular variables; having the software specifying and comissioning experiments without human input or consultation. Let's say there is a published metaanalysis. Just two

more studies would give it p<.01, right now it is only at p<.1 The software says to do the experiment, and the higher than one study value of the metaanalysis is gained.

Similarly, at the previously described: find a list of 1000 things that testably could have an epigenetic component, just doing those 1000 experiments avoids having human-perceived-value-bias winnow the group in a way that might miss out or exlude the development,and numeric support of, knowledge that is, when found, amazingly beautiful, or a strong basis for other research, or with tremendous (possibly technologizable) utility. For example, at epigenetics perhaps there is a “clear all

previous epigentics” chemical or environmental influence the software might find. Things based his could be highly beneficial medical or even social (videogames? circadian rhythm resetting watch?) technology.

If at a human about whom nothing is known, one third of their epigenetics are beneficial, one third have no numerically discernable effect, and one third are nonbeneficial, then a “clear all epigenetics” thing or method could bring tremendous improvement, or even make it possible to import a custom version of the beneficial epigenetics to the persons life, onto a newly cleaned and prepared physical being. Also, installing new beneficial

epigenetics could be something even better than the half of their epigenetics that is already going well.

One area of clearing epigenetics might be resetting the immune system, possibly setting it to a momentary zero. Having longevity promotion tendencies, rapamycin, the immunosupressant that makes rats live 60% longer, could be a human testable immunological reset, with longevity benefits, that could zero parts of the immune system possibly renewing the epigenetic "programmability" of allor just parts ofthe immune system. There are also far out things like a massive one week long high dose bendryl (diphenhydramine)

asmuch as causes continuous unconsciousness as a supression of immunoreaction.

It is possible that if a system is epigenetically perturbed, say a surplus of methyl donors from weird food or a period of emotional stress (I read stress causes epigenetic changes) that it has a spontaneous rate or velocity of moving back to epigenetic neutral from changed. What effects that velocity? It could be genetic, and that suggests things like protein drugs and new small molecule drugs that would then cause more rapid progression back to epigenetic neutral could be developed.

Then there could even be drugs that, when coadministered with

something that provides epigenetic benefit, say arginine (possibly) or “love” then cause that epigenetic benefit to be greater. Possible versions of more or deeper epigenetic effects are that the genes that get regulated differently from the epigenetics get regulated at a wider range of tissues. One possibility is increasing the number of ribosomes or increasing the amount of transfer RNA (tRNA), or upping the post translational modification at things like the golgi apparatus. As to new epigenetics drugs, I think a human researcher could make a very big (perhaps easy to very long) list of things that could increase or decrease epigenetic effects produced from a standard effector group. All the growth

hormones, even things like insulin and anti-insulin (glucagon); anythng that effects liver metabolism of circulating molecules.

So I may have read that protein production is circadian; It is kind of like protein production, but is mRNA production circadian? Drugs or actions/environemnts effecting anything that contours mRNA production compared with a level state graph would effect all the proteins produced at the body, modifying the entire proteome; and those drugs or possibly environmental effects could be a new Super Epigenetic agent.

So with Super epigenetic agents, is more or less better? Less

metabolic activity is published as producing better healthspan and longevity. Longevity improvements from less protein and caloric restriction ups autophagy, so it is different than less wear. So the research then is does adjusting mRNA production, with a variety of different approaches, affect lifespan. Maybe it would be a little like the way things like yeast grow faster with their histones removed, rapidifying mRNA activity at translation. More process-gradualizing histones cause longer lifespan though. So a drug that reduces mRNA activity could be a longevity drug.

Other Super epigenetics approaches/drugs: Perhaps

posttranslational modifiers like the golgi apparatus are where a lot of the noncoded epigenetic modification to actual protein molecules, not just the actual amount of protein (mRNA), happens. Drugs or environements that effect the golgi apparatus couldbe quantitatively measured as totheir epigenetic effects. These new drugs or environments might also be a source or way of doing an epigenetics reset to neutral as well.

Then there is the genetics of the golgi apparatus; do people with bigger golgi apparati have different, perhaps larger, epigentic reponses and programmability? Specifying a particular size, competency, or

genotype of golgi appartus is likely to be beneficial at genetically engineered humans.

Notably though, there could be a genome of reduced responsiveness to epigenetics thus causing the genetically engineered humans to be the wonderful, happy, kind, capable intelligent long lived persons that their genes specify them to be, with much less drift from epigenetics, and a kind of immunity to harm.

I am a human thinking about these now, but what if it were the software, automatically generating a testable epigenetics hypothesis that suggested high numeric resolvability automatic experimentation on epgentic

things? They might find a wholebunch of minimal perturbation causes large measured effect structures and causes.

Further applications of software that finds causes, or numerically verifiable, testable phenomena drivers:
Marionettes as big as money that have not been noticed yet: There could be new things, things that function with the force magnitude of money that have previously never been identified or named, either invisible or so obvious they were like air to a bird (research word: cultural trance) and experiments that can be done on these newly mathematically isolated, yet not yet named, marionettes that are as big as

money, to beneficially technologize as well as improve them for human well being.

Numeric methods matching software could find new things, some might be better than money. There are many marionettes that might have a money like magnitude of directive causation/correlation. Or improving my math metaphor quality a little: New marionettes, money like yet different, perhaps like vectors pointing to beneficial different cartesian quadrants, with bigger or similar magnitude, possibly these marionettes are also mathematically functionally describable as derivatives with visual graphs that have smooth curves of improvement with, considering some 3d systems,

fewer saddle-curves risking drop-off.

Interestingly, while finding new marionettes similar as to their equational effect as money, the software might find an equation, possibly a vector (or something better) that pointed to the same quadrant, possibly at a slightly differerent angle, than what wouldhave been called moneyduring the 21st century. It could be called money2 and have different, but similar predictable effects. Money2 might be different kind of money that comes from software that finds, and can possibly build or architect causal constellations (marionettes);

Causal constellations

(marionettes) can also be calm, nifty, voluntary technology objects. Considering (upstream causal function near equivalence) new money2 marionettes (physically measured and active at world, with causal effects and predictable components) equations might bethingslike money2 and money 4, possibly previously at human experieince as things like a fiat currency, a material-based currency, or bitcoin. These do most of the same stuff, even when viewed mathematically, mostly, but do have some differences, and those differences could be compared for benefit and further technologized. So the main idea here is that really really nice intelligent people, who mean well, could find (math) marionettes with similar

math descriptors to money, then make that new marionette thing which is like money, active at the same social space as money, so people can then cumulatively utilize whichever is more beneficial. It is beneficial to study which new kinds of money, like money2 are actually of greater benefit.

There couldevenbe a plurality fthese newmarionettes. Note these are different than financial technologies a new marionette to have a better thing that functions, in many ways, like money, but isbetter.

Is it possible that thinking of a new marionette on purpose could be a beneficial technology.

The thing is that the software that mathematically finds causality upstream to make a constellation of causality (a marionette) is using actual measurements and suggesting verification experiments. The thing is if I think it would be beneficial to think of a constellation of causes (a new marionette) that causes people to be kind totheir children, searching the data for stuff that does something similar could generate a high-resolution easy experiment, but as a human I would still have to

Previously a financial inventor/technologist might come up with the idea of a corpporation, basically a shares company. BUt that corporation

runs kind of like a computer program of a “game” at the money environement.

Some are well known like parenting, genetics, language, “seemliness”/some equation that includes, but is larger than, behaving socially at a frequently occuring behavioral range, also at some humans the preference for order compared with the interval-of-perceived convenience (big five conscientiousness); notably impulsiveness as compared with planning and order (like big 5) can completely change the direction, application, pooling, availability, and utility of money; humans during the 20th century AD spanned a range of debt to savings, with some using planning. Upstream of money

might be g, general intelligence, as it could possibly correlate with a beneficial testable financial milieu more predictively than assets, earnings and income, liquidity, and high availability of money at society. These are just human thoughts, the technology of the software finding a bunch of marionettes, possibly hundreds or thousands, with more effect than money could create new beneficial technologies.

So if economics is like a science of money, the new marionettes would have their own completely new sciences with new names. For example one marionette new during the 20th century AD is genetics, so now there is genomics.

Thinking about the software that uses all/most published numerics as something like a periodic table to make new predictions and match phenomena to: Also, people might be considered with calculus as moving curves described with an equation like a derivative; that compares with point measurements of people used in popular and some published research-on-humans culture that previously might have said things like “people are more permissive about letting their children play alone on suburban playgrounds now than they were last year.”, could be replaced with a differential equation and, visually a swooshy bumpy graph. Sort of like the way a vector states direction and magnitude, and a graphed

derivative shows acceleration and duration.

It is possible some things it could be beneficial to predict about humans could be described with mathematics that communicates better and, both at software and at the human mind, suggests technologizable, quantitatively measured improvements.

DQCE (Delayed Quantum Choice Eraser) retrocausal modification of conception: so perhaps previously described is how having a delayed quantum choice eraser (DQCE) linked to which particular one of 10,000 sperm samples (gametes) is utilized to make a person, while also having the system be physics/laser observable a decade or a couple

decades after the mechanism specified a initial sperm sample causes retrocausal genome editing. That way an observation of the DQCE sperm selector one or two decades (or more chronological moments) farther along the time span then causes a different sperm sample to be used retrocausally; A completely different person results from the DQCE linked gamete chooser. That gives the person the ability to specify a do-over of their life whenever they like. If someone feels they would like to be blonder they just click on blonder at the computer application that is linked to a photon observing machine. The thing is someone online says retroactively observing the gamete-choosing photon only effects that one

timeline, but perhaps the vast majority of persons, at the many MWI timelines, who would like to modify their past step up and participate telling the DQCE sperm chooser they would like an improvement. Let's say a teenager has a crush, and would like to talk to their crush. All they have to do is go to the software and click "favor sperm with social skills", It is possible perhaps a majority of persons exepriencing a crush try this out, so if a million or trillion Yous occur at the MWI, most of them will have a crush, and seek to modify their genetics to have a more optimized love life; those possibly beyond trillions of teenagers mostly opt to improve their dating acumen. This causes most versions of the teenager to

improve at the majority of the MWI universes where the conception uses a DQCE sperm sorter. This most-timelines opt-in to an improvement, benefitting perhaps the majority of area under the MWI curve, goes with other things besides quality of romance. As the genetics of newly conceptualized beneficial things (isolateable beneficial modal behaviors), like say moving towards opportunity, or being well rested are found, then people, at whatever their chronological age when the new modal beneficial choosable are characterized, opt for those benefits.

Notably as all the sperm samples that the DQCE and software that foster choice and updates at

conceptions based on eugenics samples already, so the person still has their intelligence, kindness, longevity, beauty, and median or better social skills at every sperm sample. Readdressing their conception they just have the ability to opt for even more of some characteristic. Going from 99.99th percentile of g intelligence to 99.999th percentile could be a DCQE software navigable upgrade.

Notably, the sperm samples can be analyzed with technology that improves throughout the person's chronological life. Gene sequencing a separate sample to that of the actual used sperm gives a 40 year old more phenotype from genotype choice

precision than that available to the earlier teen.

So out of of 10,000 samples it is possible that the human editing their past can converge on what they feel and think is optimum phenotypically, that is physically, influencing on their actual personal behavior and, if they like, things about their body done a different way based on their observations of actual human society. Perhaps if it were a 1950 AD conception being edited, a drafted male might modify their past conception to produce a college-likely genius girl/woman who is outside of government draft policy. They are twice as likley to skip the draft: College likelihood increased, female sex likelihood increased or

determined. A woman that had a difficult pregnancy might opt to edit her reconception to be a male person with the genetics of easy birth, so that male person's female descendents had an easier time of pregnancy.

I do not know the math of MWI universes, which as of 2019 AD seem to emphasize comparing infinities or possible finite quantities that are notably large, like quantities greater than the integer number of photons in the universe. Upgradeable with improved math and research that I or others do, is the possible idea that if a person edits their conception once a year during the first 200 years of their life, or more and longer lifespan, based on reconceiving for greater

longevity, it is possible that the conception edits that a 20 year old does and thus resulting lives, occupy a describable fraction of the sum of all the versions of the person generated; Compare that 20 year old area-under curve at MWI with the number of person versions produced when a 14 year old edits their own conception. If there are a trillion MWI versions of the 14 year old, which as more moments occur, branch to become a quadrillion 20 year olds, Then the 20 year old has a different proportion of genotypic->phenotypic capabilities and personality forms. A 110 year old might have different values and preferences when they edit their conception than a 14 year old.

It is perceptibly rational and beneficial to begin a person's conception with the most eugenics optimized gametes available, then at conception upgrades, the conception is edited to heighten benficiality based on actual behaviors and feelings of the person as well as characteristics of the people they are around and possibly their "society".

If a person thinking about causing a child to come into being did not know what else to do they could start out with moment of first conception optimized gametes (sample one at the DCQE sperm sorter), then augment that with having the DQCE sperm choice software be guided by the child-generating human's nomination

of a person, Artificial Intelligence, or software that they think knows better than them (the person that initiated the conception of a child). AT one imaginable application, that way, when at 14 I DCQE sperm-sortation upgrade my conception to produce a phenotype with better social skills so I can effortlessly talk with my romantic crush at 14, that preference is complemented with what the AI, or esteemed person thinks might be beneficial as well. So, more social fluency might be augmented with greater tallness, as the AI knows that taller people experience others spontaneously suggesting new opportunities more often, and however well the romance goes it is likely I will find more opportunities, of all beneficial

kinds, at the new phenotype’s future valuable.

Frequent reconception updates could be optimal: also, ease of use in editing one’s own conception (At 2019 AD this would be perhaps a few clicks on a computer that was linked to the photonics of the DCQE apparatus) favors frequent editing, which might go along with more improvements, thus a notably happier more satisfying life for those large, possibly finite, or possibly infinite yet of different size, MWI (Many Worlds Interpretation of physics) generated persons. As I perceive it, conception edits made in earlier youth would have more area under the curve at the MWI than conception edits a 200 year

old does. So, rather than it being a momentous thing to edit one's conception it could be a casual frequent thing done out of optimism as well as when seeking a solution for a nonoptimality.

Also, there is a computer scieince or mathematics approach to optimizing number of sperm samples, the beneficial eugenics base of all the sperm samples, and how much can be addressed (the gamete based genome database span and size)

Of course, with a mechanism that produces synthetic genomes, at new purposefully produced usable gametes, the synthetic genome DCQE gamete chooser/changer can actually have a many bit (like 256 bit or greater) factorial

genetic space that the further subsequent chronological moment DCQE observations can then adjust to change the person being conceived or reconceived's life. That creates more possible genomes than just the sperm sorter version. As of 2019 AD the sperm sorter is buildable now.

As an MWI thing, it is possible that the custom-genome space at a DQCE genome chooser thing could be more beneficial to more people if it had a group of known beneficial, talented, and physiologically and mentally well genomes as base templates. Noting I do not actually know the math of the MWI, the possibility of nonfinite combinatorics suggests that basing the combinatoric possibilities of

conceptions and edited reconceptions on a bunch of known to be optimal templates could produce phenotypes, genotypes, personalities and human behaviors that have a mean, median, mode, and perhaps “attractor” towards optimality.

Using templates might reduce the “MWI risk” of a “simple” combinatoric of all possible human DNA sequences. At the risk of causing people, that is humans, to remain people, that is humans, using optimal or near optimal templates for synthetic gamete DQCE reconception editing could make better MWI branches. Known near optimal templates could MWI area-under-the curve favor human, that is

people’s genotypes and phenotypes that actually produce conceptions and edited reconceptions that come from a group more statistically/numerically likely to be sentient, happy, well, three, four or five times more intelligent than Treon Verdery, with multicentury longevity, beneficial and also of benefit to other actual sentient humans.

At the sperm or egg choice version of the DQCE conception and reconception technology, there are some CS(computer science)/math branching and batching equations and modelling that are likely to heighten the span and scope of the possible beneficial genomes; Although it could be a different number or

quantity, thinking of 10,000 sperm samples: thinking MWI-math, mathematically is it better to group these on subject, that is specifiable genotype and thus phenotype, branches with 300 sperm samples at each subject? Thinking about the 14 year old that is editing their reconception so they can particularly enjoy dating and romance, and easily talk with their romantic crush: one Group of subject area gamete samples available, that is a particular version, of this might be 300 sperm samples isolated based on the genetics of 99th percentile of [big five psychology test] absence of neuroticism with 70th percentile at extraversion. It is possible that at the 14 year old's first origin conception the 50th percentile of extraversion

was used as a conception basis. The 14 year old can use the DQCE gamete specifying software to do reconception, making themselves more sociable while maintaining the already existing eugenics benefits which are also present at the 300 samples of sperm.

At 2019 AD, sperms or eggs could be gathered, prior to research supported knowledge of a genetic basis for, on personality, appearance, and achievement of gamete donors. I favor a technology that concentrates eugenics beneficial genes at stem cell produced eggs and sperm. Notably though, a 2019 AD version of DQCE conception editing can actually use a 20th century style collected eggs and sperms to produce genotype and

phenotype change. The 14 year old editing their reconception can make use of existing gamete technology.

Noting the math and computer science of gamete groupings, branches, and sources; There is a possible beneficial effect, sort of the opposite of externalities, that are system tendencies towards benefit even without, or prior to gamete specification at reconception. If you use the Scandinavian population to draw the 10,000 sperm/gamete sample from then the reconception adjustable genomes come preloaded with benefits that occur that precede optimizing specification at the databese/selectable pool of DCQE editable gametes. If you use

Swedish people blondeness is likely to be spontaneous without an DCQE reconception effort. Danish genomes favor tallness, again a beneficial background effect that, although also choosable at DQCE sperm sortation, is like a spontaneously produced environmental good.

So, even absent knowing, or prior to knowing what the actual phenotype expressed human genome does, it is possible to take the gamete samples from groups that have measurable individual and social or even societal beneficial or more optimal trends compared with a global median person. Although it is possible to imagine various measures of: above the global median at optimality, could vary,:

it is possible that the genetics of the 99th percentile of human well being, regardless of the society that human is located at could be combined with 99th percentile of societal well being to produce a physical location to gather gamete as well as stem cell culture samples at.

(Although there is more to it, it is possible to think of society as groups of persons having phenotypes with a bulk measurable effect) Combining the genetics of 99th percentile of an individual doing well regardless of culture, with, and also finding the 99th percentile of beneficial optimal exsiting culture to give a geographic region, could be combined to create a beneficial background good trend and

metanalytic trend; a good stock base that supports particular benefits from specified gene or gamete eugenics. It is possible the Scandinavian nations, notably the measured as happiest-in-the-world like Denmark, or the world leader in educational effectiveness, Finland, combine 99th percentile of individual success with 99th percentile of society-wide beneficial function. At 99th percentile in both individual well being and effective functioning of a society noting that is at least partially the result of a mass of phenotypically and genotypically similar individuals, Scandinavian sperm, egg and tissue culture stem cell donors have numeric support as an optimal eugenics base.

Notably: thinking on societies as groups of interacting phenotypes, such society-wide things as qunatitatively measured subjective well being (happiness), prosperity and longevity might be causally linked to things like having a minimum as well as maximum measured percentage of humans phenotypically exist at some measured value of the Big five personality test like conscientiousness. So some quantity of people, at some numerical distribution of measured conscientiousness, is correlatable, and possibly linkable as an actual cause, to societal well being. Notably there might be a different, less optimal amount of well being at higher than the optimal quantities-of-persons-having or amplitude of

conscientiousness while that phenotypic group causes human experience as a society.

Scientific research on the optimized and optimizable genotype and phenotype of an individual that is the optimized individual, while simultaneously optimizing the phenotypic group of persons effect that society might be considered as, increases opportunities for beneficial optimization. This also creates additional ways of viewing eugenic benefit, as well as the benefits of conception and reconception at a DQCE gamete sorter.

Math: local minima, curve landscape and topology, that combine and portray the

optimization of individual genome, genotype, phenotype, and lived consciousness based in phenotype, while also noting awareness of societal bulk phenotype, from genotype, effects is possibly likely to have many, curves, pockets, as well as heights at a varied mathematical topological landscape. Awareness that that the landscape of optimization could be structurally and mathematically varied could reduce concerns, or a tendency to, social or cultural ideological themes. It is possible to say, “we can figure it out, and it is engineerable, and the math structures and possibly visualizations communicate that that’s different than saying or endorsing all tidiness and

heightened intelligence with polite manners is a monocultural preference”.

Note: I perceive that from a pattern resonance IT/IL technology perspective that blonde people experience synchonized (similar to Jungian synchronicity) favor and benefit just from having hair that is light colored. Making people blonde, is, from what I might comprehend, beneficial to them paranormally while being absent risk of any personal paranormal influence or risk at their own lives. Having blonde children benefits those children and the people they grow up to be. Swedish sperm, eggs, and tissue culture provide this as a benefit

when used as a provides-environmental-good resource of richness, where that richness is present even prior to specific study.

One way to make subject-specific, that is genotype and phenotype of physiological and mental well being DQCE specifiable gametes is to use stem cells to mass produce sperm or eggs with preferred genomes and characteristics. While it is possible during 2019 AD to get a sperm or egg or stem cell sample from a person that is measured as being and doing well, with various beneficial genetic, phenotypic, and personality characteristics, another way to do it is to composite an accumulation of eugenics beneficial genes.

Compositing and accumulating beneficial genes together to make new, sperm or eggs usable at conception, and available for DQCE reconception use that have a high benefit starting eugenic makeup: Find persons, with genotypes (genomes, SNPs) that are beneficial at eugenics. It is possible to make sperm as well as eggs from stem cells derived from those humans, that is persons. Clonal stem cells from persons with valued eugenics already have one or more beneficial genes or versions of genes.
Differentiate the stem cells from different eugenic samples or persons into sperms and eggs.
Combine the large volume of sperms and eggs derived from stem cells, that have two or more

different eugenics beneficial genes, that are different from each other, to produce hundreds of thousands or millions of blastocycts at tissue culture. These bulk produced blastocysts will have varying genetics, giving an opportunity to note, characterize the genomes of, and gather the blastocysts that have the highest actual number, that is amount, of beneficial eugenics genes. This is a way to accumulate numerous eugenics beneficial genes at a tissue culture much faster than selective sequential breeding of humans could produce.

It is even possible that of 20,000 human genes that this bulk recombination and blastocyst generation, with sequencing to

characterize genomes and make the preferred next generation of increased eugenics genes sperm, eggs or tissue culture, could optimize all 20,000 human genes. Notably software or artificial intelligence could be used to predict which versions of the 20,000 genes are optimal; then these entire-full-genome optimized genes could be combined and bulk produced making optimized sperms, eggs, as well as stem cell cultures to create humans that then benefit from having eugenics optimized genomes.

Notably at DQCE conception and reconception editing different versions of an optimized core genome can be produced and navigated. That is a way to make

it so all of the 10,000 sperm and egg samples available at reconception DQCE all have a fully functional eugenics beneficial core shared source.

As previously described, concentrate genes, bulk produce, and sequence, a plurality of times, adding more and more eugenics beneficial genes to the sperms and eggs balstocysts and tissue cultures produced at each cycle of :sperm, egg, blastocyst, gene sequencing of blastocyst, Then accumulate and group these beneficial genes together to produce a multibeneficial sperms or eggs. Use stem cell technology to produce clonal sperm as well as clonal eggs; combine these eggs and sperm, grow to blastocyst, sequence the

genes from blastocyst occuring at the new combination; then combine these eugenics concentrated gametes more times to produce sperm as well as eggs with all of the preferred genes. Then sort the created gametes on largest simultaneous number of beneficial gene versions, then stem cell clone the improved and concentrated gamete genetics of eugenics gametes.

Mathematics of DQCE reconception as well as genetics: One approach, previously described as finding the overlap of 99th percentile of optimized individual genetics with 99th percentile optimal societial, with societal specifiable as a society being a bulk effect of a group of phenotypes arising from

genomes, genetics and genome, as an approach notes there is a mathematics of getting both right simulataneously.

Finding beneficial environmental goods, or good stock from as-yet-unmeasured genetics and phenotypic determinants: Besides 99th percentile individual genomes and phenotypes, and group-phenotype-formed-societies which could be good-stock sampleable as geographic areas at 99th percentile societies: it is possible the overlap of 99th percentile genome based individual well being and human behaviors frequent at almost all human beings could be basis for genetic sampling to find eugenics beneficial optimums. People who are at the 99th percentile of child

well being and resulting child-outcome while being human physiological parents could have a genotypic and phenotypic basis for their optimality; this optimizes and benefits one area of physiological, phenotypic and genomic form doing something, having and raising children, that most humans do. Finding the phenotypes and genotypes of optimality of other things that almost all humans do could contribute to beneficial genetic optimization, eugenics, as well as DQCE reconception technology.

Humans, that is people, also sleep and have mental focus and attentiveness. Genomics of 99th percentile beneficial and enjoyable quality of sleeping as well as 99th percentile ability to

focus and/or be receptively alert and attentive, could be areas of human-spanning benefit.

I perceive researchers have measured differences between humans, that is people, at measured quantity and character of moments of perceived enjoyable consciousness. So phenotypically and genetically there is published support that some people exist more than others, that is they have more moments, as well as possibly higher amplitude moments as well as sustained sensations or mental actuality of aware-mind, that they experience as enjoyable. 99th percentile genetics of voluntary enjoyment of presence of mind are a possible eugenics technology item as well;

existing, like having children and sleeping is another area where the phenotype of a shared most-all-humans activity has an optimizable genetics.

That brings up an optimization opportunity for a person using DQCE gametes as part of reconception. As the effect of genes and particular genes and other physiological effectors of herditary phenotype and quantifiably measurable behavior, is cumulatively found, and as researchers and technologists think of new kinds of benefits, or features (like doing DQCE reconception to cause more moments of enjoyable awareness) the person specifying the gametes used at their reconception can DQCE modify

their gametes retrocausally around those beneficial new features.

Noting the generation of new things, genomic improvement could come from more than enthused preference for better knownthings, as well as genomic solutions to non-optimal things (like DQCE reconception as genetically and phenotypically female dodges selective service at some countries), completely new features could be researched and technologized from the genome, notably the DQCE reconception sperm or other gamete list of choosables.

DQCE could also modify epigenetics, like the chemical environment at conception, in a

retrocausally programmable way: another technology at the DQCE (Delayed Quantum Choice Eraser) retrocausal modification of conception, called reconception, is the DQCE gamete technology also having a, technologically derived from actual research, adjustable epigenetic component. If, either surplus or reduced ambient ATP during the blastocyst stage is found to have beneficial effects, then the DQCE mechanism could make it so humans, that is people, could specify the amount of ATP at their reconception, as conception environment. As a technology, not only could 100 studied epigenetic influences and/or chemicals be available for adjustment, it is possible a future addressing of a parallel photonic

array form of DQCE could actually produce retrocausally created words or numbers. One reconception option is to have the reconception biology technician or the robot doing what the human biology technician would do, is to order that particular number chemical from a chemical supply company and make it a contributor to the retrocausally enhanced epigenetic environment. It is also possible that the parallel photonic DQCE array produced chemical number could be a generator of any IUPAC chemical structure, for use as a reconception biological technology active ingredient. It is possible that retrocausal epigenetics could provide even more options and customizable benefit to the person, like the 14

year old, modifying their biologically conceived being retrocausally.

Along with the custom chemical DQCE reconception technology, perhaps 100 different well researched chemicals or protocol variants,possibly effecting epigenetics, could be part of DQCE's adjustability from observing a photon path and then retrocausally changing the path of the photon with a chronologically subsequent (possibly decades "later") observation, where the photon path is linked at the dynamic moment of the apparatus to which particular gametes and epigenetic variables are then freshly optimized to be.

The math of how many persons, as MWI branch individuals, (versions of you) that experience benefit from DQCE reconception, when figured out, could support some notably beneficial, perhaps standard ways to use the technology. Just thinking, the presence of an artificial intelligence guided companion robot, or even just a (human, that is person), sentience utilized software companion, at that particular person's life physically and chronologically prior to a reconception action, could cause the person to be re-befriended or raised, by that companion robot again, while the robots software and hardware might be math of MWI unlikely to change;

This thing where some context

might be durable and conserved amonst MWI branches could be beneficial at the experience of preference and doing planning and actions. The 14 year old that would like to be socially fluent and talk to their romantic crush, where that crush is a person they actually know of at their MWI branch universe, could possibly structure things at their DQCE reconception so that their crush still existed accessibly to their personal being even after the DQCE reconception. One possibility is unique-genome online conversational addresses. A companion robot urges you to start online chat with the genetically identical person to the person you, prereconception, had a crush on.

Although I do not know MWI math, theoretically she, the romantic crush, would not change her genetics ; these seems particularly true when the 14 year old's romantic crush is even 1 second older than them: genetically, the other person already exists at the reconceived person's MWI branch, and could be sought out after reconception.

(A thing that could amplify appreciation for, and contribute to the actual production of reconception would be a popular treatment of an MWI reconception romance, it could get a lift from the popularity of the "groundhog day" movie genre, only the technology is functional, and there are actual things you can do to have things go well with the

person you feel affectionate towards)

Technology: how much mutliplexed massively parallel delayed quantum choice eraser structure is possible? At some simple amount; the published first DQCE, you can produce a new output from a different observation of optical path; can you do enough path variation and quantity to code out an ascii sentence? If you can then you can send yourself a note in the past. I have not seen that supported or criticised at anything online or published that I have heard of though.

MWI branch durables: that person to person possible availability is qualitatively different than the

general lift of “the romantic reconceived 14 year old going from 50th percentile extroverted to 70th percentile extroverted makes then twice as likely to have an active romantic life, regardless of who with” effect

The production of MWI branch durables, reminds me of math and electronics: If you have a conductor, and insultor, and a semiconductor you can make a variety of different things. Three kinds of things makes a construction kit. The companion robot being a durable, could have system generating/engineering object generating utility. Another durable might be City. A person conceived at a city might be likely to see particular views, travel particular streetswith some

likelihood, or even predictably attend one of a few different possible educational institutions.

One use of this durable object effect at reconception is having different physical locations a reconception could occur at. IVF like reconception versions, contrasting with the 2019 AD, fairly easy, “which tube of actual photonically lighted up sperm the woman grabs from a sampling”, could have the reconceived person specified to physically originate at new location. A person could use IVF technology DQCE reconception to be an IVF conceptus as Copenhagen or Stockholm instead of Seattle.

Is this ethical: MWI autoreplicating increasor

technology; how does crispr/cas9 work? If I think of a technology that puts MWI technology, possibly DQCE or a cool matter MWI branch or macro-branch (world), or even mini-branch, generator that is more branch producing abundant than warmth, like the sun, that causes more of itself to exist, can the numerics of math accumulations of new universes be made probabalistically near completely likely, or higher? It may be possible to do a paticular thing at a majority of MWI universes.

There might be something online already about how to do an action, or even think of things such that the number of MWI universes that contain the preferred effect or product is

higher.

It is possible that humans customizing the MWI universes could be beneficial, the thing is that I do not know the effect of the lightcone on the MWI; if it matters then the sun could be causing so many MWI branches that human produced MWI events, while engineered to be highly beneficial, might not always be the majority MWI effect. Technology Modifying the amount of MWI universes produced; particularly figuring out a way to make something that produces more MWI branch unverses than the sun does: degrees of freedom, heightened dimensionality compared with electron spectral emission levels. Possible Dyson sphere could

process the surrounded solar output at a physically new structure or possibly material, that has lots more MWI branch universe generation than quantum emission levels produce, like might be previously frequent at the sun. I saw electrons arranged as a fractal online, can electron systems with more dimensionality like that, possibly degrees of freedom, produce more MWI branches; simplistically could a fractal nuke make lots more MWI branches than another kind?

I may have read that things like electrons and photons are actually fields, and that observing them causes a kind of concentration measurable as presence, such as the presence of

a particle or a wave arising from the field; so are there other things that can be done to existing fields to make more than electron-or-photon-produced quantities of MWI branches from perturbing, changing the shape of, merging or dividing, fields? One far out idea: Some molecule, when placed at an EM field, that causes much more field concentration than, or perhaps causative of multiple point or wave effects.

An very unlikely source of more-MWI-branches than the sun could be vacuum energy generation between two plates; the casimir effect; If a person puts a metal

plate between Jupiter and Neptune, the casimir system between the jupiter plate and the neptune plate has half the diameter, so it produces some new amount of casimir-effect energy and particles, say it doubles or halves. So, does this work on stellar objects and interstellar distances? If you put a plate between the sun and stellar object rigel, do you get half or double the amount of casimir effect energy, and is it a really big amount of casimir effect energy because the other two plates are stellar sized big? I have a perception that the eentsier the distance the higher the casimir effect energy though, so rather than big far things, perhaps eentsy things near each other might make more energy and thus

more MWI branches. It is possible that eentsy gravitational singularities, even though I think I read that they evaporate rapidly, might squish things together nearer than any other matter system; it could be that even though their contents are outside an observation horizon, that they have extremely high casimir particle and energy generation from things there being nearer to each other than, perhaps, the parts of a nucleus are from the other parts of nucleus. So, theoretically things like particle accelerators, or possibly some other technologies I have thought of, could generate eentsy gravitational singularities, and these could then mass-produce MWI branches from causing things to be near each

other.

quantum entangled photons seem to possibly have *less* MWI branches as modifying one determines the other, whereas if they were non-dependent there would be twice as much quantum different occurence MWI branchability. So is there a way to make hyper non-entangled photons? These might have greater difficulty of observation; giant wavelengths bigger than a planet might not be “collapsible” with any human observation to go from being fields to being observed as waves or particles So perhaps then there is some new “multipoint” or “multiwave” field collapse of the bigger than a planet wavelength energy

possible.

It might be possible to make a reflecting shape that causes fields, that when observed “cause” particles or waves, to be different shapes. Different shapes fields might make different amounts of MWI branches. Like a 1 cm thing wiggling at water, makes 1 cm waves. but if it is next to a wall, and you get the timing functional, can make, I think waves that are many cm tall, from reinforcement, also a little like pumping a recreational swing.

If presumably they figure out if, or what kind, of observers matter, if the observers do matter, could a superobserver (a computer/IC like technology, possibly vastly

multiparallel that is more effective at observing than a human; previously described) or even just a human observer view a really big, rich, unresolved, or preresolution field, possibly as a group, “a glance”, to cause field identities, like photons or electrons, much larger in amount of MWI branches than some other object, like the sun. One vaugely weirds-a-person-out example is the 2019 AD photonic image of a gravitational singularity. Does observing that thing have an effect on all the mass it has previously absorbed? What is the effect on that mass and its MWI branches.

Previously described are nested MWI universe technologies (optical loop around radioactive

blob, or two optical loops of different lengths); could an MWI nesting technology create a contingent effect on a massive pile of energy or matter somewhere, at a dsitance, like space? One clueless one: put the light from a quasar into an optical loop using a collimating lens, then have another optical loop with like one photon traveling physically around that at a bigger loop, where the time-to-detect the one photon is larger than the collimated quasar photon loop interval. The lighcone of the two loops overlaps, and part of the lightcones are outside each other; (I do not remember the rest of this)

Less weirding-out-of-a person is

the possibility that observing something really white and big, perhaps a quasar, causes some topology of MWI branches to occur.

it is possible that the genetics of the 99th percentile of human well being, regardless of the society that human is located at could be combined with 99th percentile of societal well being to produce a physical location to gather gamete as well as stem cell culture samples at.

Other mathematical things that provide benefit:

If you encourage casual retrocausal usage of new gametes like sperm, eggs or tissue culture,

then many more varities of improved well being branches occur.

Technology that enhances architectural objects:
I viewed a video about a three dimensional printer that printed what looked like a dwelling with cement coming out of a nozzle. A technological improvement to this could be producing cement-air foam at the nozzle, the cement foam would have higher R value from the air that is part of the cement foam. Another possible improvement to 3d printed archtectural objects is to print calcium sulfate from a nozzle, Calcium sulfate is the majority chemical in wallboard. 3D printing calcium sulfate shapes like sides of walls, curves,

rounded areas would create better aesthetics at the architectural object while also being a building material with some known characteristics; also as wallboard is cardboard clad calcium sulfate, it is possible a 3d printer could, among its materials that are nozzle-capable, have a printable material, possibly a polymer, that would replace the cardboard-like cladding at the 3d printed calcium sulfate; it is also possible that 3d printed calcium sulfate items could have a central area with many air spaces, and then have a hole gradient that goes to 100% calcium sulfate at the outer surface. The benefit is that this produces a high R value calcium sulfate building material, improving dwelling or other architectural object comfort and

increasing energy efficiency.

Technology that could improve swamp coolers, also known as evaporative coolers: I read about how, when making activated carbon, the carbon is soaked in a solution of calcium chloride then dried to crystallize the calcium chloride; the proliferation of the microcrystals at the carbon causes a big increase in the surface area of the carbon after the calcium chloride is rinsed out. Noting that swamp coolers have evaporative pads that evaporate water, it seems possible that the microsurface area as well as the total surface area of a cellulose material could be increased with the same ionic-crystal microtexturing treatment that produces more surface area at

activated carbon. The benefit is that the new hyper surface area evaporative cellulose pad could wick away even more moisture at a smaller actual pad size. Smaller pad size could make the entire swamp cooler smaller, possibly making them slightly cheaper to produce.

Another possible technology at swamp cooler moisture pads is to microtexture/custom surface the cellulose pads with a laser to produce a very hydrophilic positive contact angle surface; a positive angle contact surface is kind of the opposite of a: negative contact angle surface, NCAS is a kind of a thing with superhydrophobic projections all over the surface. I saw an image of a hydrophilic positive angle

**contact
surface (PACS), it looked kind of like: ___/ ___/.**

At a swamp cooler, whether the smaller improved moisture wicking pad is improved with crystal-caused activated carbon like treatment, or a laser texturing of the cellulose material to make PACS, the greater moisture wicking ability could support a new type of airflow: coanda air flow, and a variety of air sheet entrainment could cause much larger amounts of air to flow past the moist pad.

Air quotes: a modification to Twitter software, or other communication software, that causes more people to voluntarily enjoy tweeting, and to tweet

more:

A popular tweeting person could be imagined as tweeting or retweeting quite a few tweets per day; thay have a bunch of followers; it is possible that the rapid feedback of seeing other people retweet their content and/or comment on recent tweets right away causes psychological reward, a feeling of fun, and behavioral psychology word: shaping that causes them to tweet more items even more frequently. That could be a popular twitter user. My perception is that (2019 AD) there are also some twitter users who get few views, retweets, or any kind of reinforcement-loop creating feedback.

If there was a feature at twitter that could increase the actual number of persons that are popular tweeters then beneficially quantitatively more high-participation people would tweet more things, more frequently. Such a feature could be: Air quotes. Air quotes at twitter would be little thing like an emoji “” immediately followed with the contents of a tweet that the popular tweeter did not write, but that another person wrote. A person who is not yet popular could ask a popular tweeter, “hey could you airquote this”, and then the popular tweeter puts the tweet they did not write into the air quote form/format. Then all the many followers of the popular tweeter can react to the airquoted content from the new,

yet-to-be-popular writer. It is an easy software structure that allows people to easily share and ride on each other's coattails when they like each other. If it works the popularity of the fresh material writer goes up causing a quantitative increase in the number of twitter users that have lively psychological-reward feedback cycles, aka people having fun while communicating.

My perception is that during 2018 AD Twitter had a very simple user interface. There is a simple user interface way to queue up airquotes material: A popular tweeter could just have a page next to their ID page, their airquotes page, that has say 8 textboxes on it, and anyone visiting their airquotes page could

write anything they liked in one or more of the 8 textboxes. The view that the popular tweeter has of the multi-textbox page has a little “send” icon next to each one. All the popular tweeter has to do is to click “send” if they like what the airquote content says. Airquote suggestion textboxes are editable anytime by anyone, so itis really casual.

Note: although airquotes is a twitter technology I emphasize that there are many other intellectually and socially growthful sites and applications and software available online and even offline on phones and consoles. I think that research that compares something like the top 100 most popular communications and group

participation sites and applications as to their effect on intellectual capacity maintenance and growth, cumulative drift or variations produced at a measure like the big five personality test, as well as the 100 most popular sites/applications effect on subjective well being (happiness) would have value.

cytoNucleus drugs. I read that nuclear transport proteins, peptides, and possibly even little organic molecules like melatonin may cause things to be preferentially moved across the nuclear membrane into the nucleus. Generally recognized as safe GRAS food additives are numerous, and there is a list; The list of all FDA, EU, Chinese approved drugs is another list.

Take both of these lists then make a variation on each of the GRAS chemicals as well as all the pharmacopia drugs with a nuclear transport peptide, protein, or perhaps just melatonin molecule attached to it. That creates several thousand new testable drugs, of unknown effect, that can be screened as a library to find any, active at the nucleus, that do beneficial things. I perceive many things are published as having epigenetic effect, at least one thing in the nucleus though could affect "epigenetic silencing" so it is possible screening the GRAS/drug nuclear transport peptide/protein/little organic molecule drug library could find new drugs with epigenetic effects.

Another possible nuclear membrane passing drug that could reach the nucleus is a blob of lipids, like some lipid bilayer fragment, with just one chemical or drug attached to it. Theoretically the external cytomembrane as well as the actual nuclear membrane will take up the extra lipid bilayer fragment that has the drug attached to it, it might even be that the incorporated lipid bilayer fragment has an even chance of pointing the drug molecule into the cytoplasm or outwards towards the between-cyte space. (As to the drug attached to lipid bilayer becoming a part of the cytomembrane or nuclear membrane: hey it could work; radioactive labelled lipids swap

out, i perceive, more than 1/3 of a cytomembrane’s composition in less than 1/2 an hour). I have heard of a lipid raft; a more sophisticated or possibly more effective thing than a bilayer blob with a drug attached to it could be a lipid raft with a drug attached to it that gets spontaneously incorporated into the cytomembrane.

I could think better if I knew more math.

If it does it might be easier to produce at new human genes, gene therapy or GI tract bacteria